



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,304	12/02/2003	Sabrina Tai-Chen Yeh	40000-0045 (50T5643.02)	5222
20480	7590	02/19/2009	EXAMINER	
STEVEN L. NICHOLS			TAYLOR, JOSHUA D	
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
10653 S. RIVER FRONT PARKWAY				2426
SUITE 150				
SOUTH JORDAN, UT 84095				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/19/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/727,304	YEH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JOSHUA TAYLOR	2426	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7, 10-31, 34-43, 46-51, 70, 72-77 and 80-84 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-7, 10-31, 34-43, 46-51, 70, 72-77 and 80-84 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Response to amendment received on 10/6/2008. Claims 7, 14, 25, 43 and 70 have been amended. Claims 52-69 and 71 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/6/2008 concerning claims 10 and 12 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As cited in the following rejection, Yap discloses that several modes of operation can be employed, involving viewing and recording two or more live and recorded signals (paragraph [0031]), in manners that disclose the claims of claims 10 and 12.

Applicant's arguments with respect to all other claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-7 and 10-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they claim a user interface, which is not one of the statutory classes. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 10-13, 36-43, 46-51, 70, 72-77 and 80-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yap et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0040475) in view of Alten et al. (Pat. No.: US 6,661,468) and Hirasawa (Pat. No.: US 7,441,124).

Regarding claim 1, Yap discloses **a user interface for a television set connected to at least one recording device and at least one source of audiovisual programming, said user interface comprising: a first window** (Figure 2, element 271 and/or 272) **associated with a source of audiovisual programming** (paragraph [0199]); **a second window** (Figure 2, element 272 and/or 271) **associated with a connected recording device** (paragraph [0198]); **wherein said first window displays said audiovisual programming from said source of audiovisual programming** (paragraph [0199]). Yap does not explicitly disclose **a first identifier displayed in association with said first window identifying said source of audiovisual programming associated with said first window from among a plurality of sources of audiovisual programming**. However, in analogous art, Alten discloses displaying to users an indication of the source from which a program is being received (Fig. 37, column 27, lines 37-52), so that the user can know which programs are sourced from cable, satellite, broadcast, etc. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

Yap to include identifying the source of the programming. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, in that the user would have a way to know from which source the programming was coming.

Neither Yap nor Alten explicitly disclose **a second identifier displayed in association with said second window identifying said connected recording device associated with said second window.** However, in analogous art, Hirasawa discloses displaying to the user information indicative of recording source and recording destination (Figs. 70 A and 70B, column 40, lines 31-49). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yap and Alten to include identifying an associated recording device. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, in that the user would have a way to know where the material was being recorded.

Regarding claim 2, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the user interface of claim 1**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said recording device is also a second source of audiovisual programming and said audiovisual programming from said recording device is displayed in said second window** (paragraph [0208]).

Regarding claim 3, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the user interface of claim 1**, and Yap discloses **further comprising controls for controlling said connected recording device** (paragraphs [0110], [0126] and [0149]-[0150]).

Regarding claim 4, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the user interface of claim 3**, and Yap discloses **further comprising a status identifier for identifying a current operation being performed by said connected recording device** (paragraphs [0196]-[0197], Table 1).

Regarding claim 5, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the user interface of claim 3**, and Yap further discloses **wherein, when said controls are used to send a record command to said connected recording device** (paragraph [0126]), **said connected recording device automatically records said audiovisual programming being displayed in said first window** (paragraph [0199]).

Regarding claim 6, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the user interface of claim 5**, and Yap further discloses **wherein, while said connected recording device is recording, said audiovisual programming is also displayed in said second window** (paragraph [0199]).

Regarding claim 7, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the user interface of claim 3**, and Yap further discloses **wherein multiple recording devices are connected** (Figure 2, elements 205 and 255, paragraphs [0107] and [0152]-[0154], Figure 8, element 320), **said controls further comprising controls for selecting a recording device to be associated with said second window and controlled through said user interface** (paragraphs [0150]-[0151]).

Regarding claim 10, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the user interface of claim 1**, and Yap discloses **further comprising controls associated with said second window, wherein a record command issued using said controls is a command for said recording device associated with said second window to record from said source of audiovisual programming associated with said first window** (paragraph [0031]).

Regarding claim 11, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the user interface of claim 10**, and Yap discloses **further comprising a status identifier identifying a current**

operation being performed by said source of audiovisual programming (paragraphs [0126] and [0149]-[0150]).

Regarding claim 12, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the user interface of claim 10**, and Yap discloses **wherein said second window displays said audiovisual programming in response to said record command, such that both said first and second windows each display said audiovisual programming from said source of audiovisual programming associated with said first window to indicate that said recording device is recording said audiovisual programming associated with said first window** (paragraph [0031]).

Regarding claim 13, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the user interface of claim 1**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said recording device is a memory card** (paragraph [0158]).

Regarding claim 36, Yap discloses **processor-readable instructions stored on a processor-readable medium** (paragraph [0223]), **said instructions, when executed, providing an on-screen user interface for a video display device, said user interface comprising: a first window** (Figure 2, element 271 and/or 272) **associated with a source of audiovisual programming connected to said video display device** (paragraph [0199]); **a second window** (Figure 2, element 272 and/or 271) **associated with a recording device connected to said video display device** (paragraph [0198]). Yap does not explicitly disclose **a first identifier displayed in association with said first window identifying said source of audiovisual programming associated with said first window from among a plurality of sources of audiovisual programming**. However, in analogous art, Alten discloses displaying to users an indication of

the source from which a program is being received (Fig. 37, column 27, lines 37-52), so that the user can know which programs are sourced from cable, satellite, broadcast, etc. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yap to include identifying the source of the programming. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, in that the user would have a way to know from which source the programming was coming.

Neither Yap nor Alten explicitly disclose **a second identifier displayed in association with said second window identifying said connected recording device associated with said second window**. However, in analogous art, Hirasawa discloses displaying to the user information indicative of recording source and recording destination (Figs. 70 A and 70B, column 40, lines 31-49). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yap and Alten to include identifying an associated recording device. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, in that the user would have a way to know where the material was being recorded.

Regarding claim 37, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the processor-readable instructions of claim 36**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said first window displays said audiovisual programming from said source of audiovisual programming** (paragraph [0199]).

Regarding claim 38, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the processor-readable instructions of claim 36**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said connected recording device is also a second source of audiovisual programming and said audiovisual**

programming from said recording device is displayed in said second window (paragraph [0031]).

Regarding claim 39, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the processor-readable instructions of claim 36**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said user interface further comprises on-screen controls for controlling said connected recording device** (paragraphs [0110], [0126] and [0149]-[0150]).

Regarding claim 40, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the processor-readable instructions of claim 39**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said user interface further comprises a status identifier for identifying a current operation being performed by said connected recording device** (paragraphs [0196]-[0197], Table 1).

Regarding claim 41, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the processor-readable instructions of claim 39**, and Yap further discloses **wherein, when said on-screen controls are used to send a record command to said connected recording device** (paragraph [0126]), **said user interface causes said connected recording device to record said audiovisual programming being displayed in said first window** (paragraph [0199]).

Regarding claim 42, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the processor-readable instructions of claim 41**, and Yap further discloses **wherein, while said connected recording device is recording, said audiovisual programming is also displayed in said second window** (paragraph [0199]).

Regarding claim 43, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the processor-readable instructions of claim 39**, and Yap further discloses **wherein when multiple recording devices are connected to said video display device** (Figure 2, elements 205 and 255,

paragraphs [0107] and [0152]-[0154], Figure 8, element 320), **said controls further comprise controls for selecting a recording device to be associated with said second window and controlled through said user interface** (paragraphs [0150]-[0151]).

Regarding claim 46, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the processor-readable instructions of claim 36**, and Alten further discloses **wherein said user interface further comprises controls associated with said first window for selecting and controlling said source of audiovisual programming associated with said first window** (Fig. 37, column 27, lines 53-62). This claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 36.

Regarding claim 47, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the processor-readable instructions of claim 46**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said user interface further comprises a status identifier identifying a current operation being performed by said source of audiovisual programming associated with said first window** (paragraphs [0126] and [0149]-[0150]).

Regarding claim 48, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the processor-readable instructions of claim 36**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said first window displays an electronic program guide for said source of audiovisual programming associated with said first window, and said second window lists programs selected by a user from said electronic program guide** (paragraphs [0186]-[0187]).

Regarding claim 49, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the processor-readable instructions of claim 48**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said user interface causes said recording device associated with said second window to record said programs selected by a user from said electronic program guide** (paragraphs [0186]-[0187]).

Regarding claim 50, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the processor-readable instructions of claim 48**, and Yap further discloses **wherein, when multiple recording devices are available, said user interface comprises controls for selecting which recording device is associated with said second window** (paragraph [0127]).

Regarding claim 51, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the processor-readable instructions of claim 48**, and Alten further discloses **wherein, when multiple sources of audiovisual programming are available, said user interface comprises controls for selecting which source of audiovisual programming is associated with said first window** (Fig. 37, column 27, lines 53-62). This claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 36.

Regarding claim 70, Yap discloses **an audiovisual device in communication with at least one recording device, said audiovisual device comprising: a user input device (paragraph [0186]); and a user interface displayed on said audiovisual device; wherein said user interface comprises a first window (Figure 2, element 271 and/or 272) associated with a source of audiovisual programming (paragraph [0199]), and a second window (Figure 2, element 272 and/or 271) associated with said recording device (paragraph [0198]); and wherein said second window displays said audiovisual programming in response to a record command, such that both said first and second windows each display said audiovisual programming from said source of audiovisual programming associated with said first window to indicate that said recording device is recording said audiovisual programming associated with said first window** (paragraph [0031]). Yap does not explicitly disclose **wherein said user interface further comprises a first identifier displayed in association with said first window identifying said source of audiovisual programming**.

associated with said first window from among a plurality of sources of audiovisual programming. However, in analogous art, Alten discloses displaying to users an indication of the source from which a program is being received (Fig. 37, column 27, lines 37-52), so that the user can know which programs are sourced from cable, satellite, broadcast, etc. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yap to include identifying the source of the programming. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, in that the user would have a way to know from which source the programming was coming.

Neither Yap nor Alten explicitly disclose **a second identifier displayed in association with said second window identifying said connected recording device associated with said second window.** However, in analogous art, Hirasawa discloses displaying to the user information indicative of recording source and recording destination (Figs. 70 A and 70B, column 40, lines 31-49). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yap and Alten to include identifying an associated recording device. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, in that the user would have a way to know where the material was being recorded.

Regarding claim 72, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the device of claim 70**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said recording device is also a second source of audiovisual programming and audiovisual programming from said recording device is displayed in said second window** (paragraph [0031]).

Regarding claim 73, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the device of claim 70**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said user input device comprises a remote control unit** (paragraph [0041]).

Regarding claim 74, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the device of claim 70**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said user interface further comprises on-screen controls for controlling said recording device, said on-screen controls being operated with said user input device** (paragraphs [0110], [0126] and [0149]-[0150]).

Regarding claim 75, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the device of claim 74**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said user interface further comprises a status identifier for identifying a current operation being performed by said recording device** (paragraphs [0196]-[0197], Table 1).

Regarding claim 76, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the device of claim 74**, and Yap further discloses **wherein, when said on-screen controls are used to send a record command to said recording device** (paragraph [0126]), **said recording device automatically records audiovisual programming from said audiovisual source associated with said first window** (paragraph [0199]).

Regarding claim 77, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the device of claim 70**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said audiovisual device communicates with multiple recording devices** (Figure 2, elements 205 and 255, paragraphs [0107] and [0152]-[0154], Figure 8, element 320), **and said user interface comprises controls for selecting a recording device to be associated with said second window and controlled through said user interface** (paragraphs [0150]-[0151]).

Regarding claim 80, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the device of claim 70**, and Alten further discloses **wherein said user interface further comprises controls associated with said first window for selecting and controlling said source of audiovisual programming associated with said first window** (Fig. 37, column 27, lines 53-62). This claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 70.

Regarding claim 81, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the device of claim 70**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said audiovisual device communicates with said recording device through an IEEE 1394 interface** (paragraph [0108]).

Regarding claim 82, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the device of claim 70**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said audiovisual device is a computer** (paragraph [0222]).

Regarding claim 83, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the device of claim 70**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said audiovisual device is a television set** (paragraph [0222]).

Regarding claim 84, the combined teachings as stated above disclose **the device of claim 70**, and Yap further discloses **further comprising a memory card accessible to said audiovisual device, wherein said memory card is said recording device associated with said second window** (paragraph [0158]).

Claims 14-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yap et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0040475) in view of Baumgartner et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0174433).

Regarding claim 14, Yap discloses **a user interface for a television set connected to at least one recording device and at least one source of audiovisual programming, said user interface comprising: a first window** (Figure 2, element 272 and/or 271) **associated with a source of audiovisual programming; and a second window** (Figure 2, element 272 and/or 271) **associated with a connected recording device; wherein said first window displays an electronic program guide for said source of audiovisual programming** (paragraphs [0198]-[0199]), **and said second window lists programs selected by a user from said electronic program guide** (paragraphs [0186]-[0187]). Yap does not explicitly disclose wherein **said second window lists programs selected for future recording by a user from said electronic program guide**. However, in analogous art, Baumgartner discloses that an EPG can show a list of scheduled recordings (Fig. 25, paragraph [0132]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yap to include programs selected for future recording. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, in that the user would have a way to see if the all of the programs he wanted to record were in fact scheduled to record.

Regarding claim 15, the combined teachings of Yap and Baumgartner disclose **the user interface of claim 14**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said connected recording device associated with said second window automatically records said programs selected by a user from said electronic program guide** (paragraphs [0186]-[0187]).

Regarding claim 16, the combined teachings of Yap and Baumgartner disclose **the user interface of claim 14**, and Yap further discloses **wherein multiple recording devices are connected** (Figure 2, elements 205 and 255, paragraphs [0152]-[0154] and [0107], Figure 8,

element 320) and said user interface comprises controls for selecting which recording device is associated with said second window (paragraphs [0150]-[0151]).

Regarding claim 17, the combined teachings of Yap and Baumgartner disclose **the user interface of claim 14**, and Alten further discloses **wherein multiple sources of audiovisual programming are connected and said user interface comprises controls for selecting which source of audiovisual programming is associated with said first window** (Fig. 37, column 27, lines 53-62). This claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 1.

Claims, 18-31 and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yap et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0040475) in view of Alten et al. (Pat. No.: US 6,661,468) and Hirasawa (Pat. No.: US 7,441,124), and further in view of Baumgartner et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0174433).

Regarding claim 18, Yap discloses **a video display device comprising: a screen; a user interface displayed on said screen; and a connection to at least one recording device and at least one source of audiovisual programming; wherein said user interface comprises a first window** (Figure 2, element 271 and/or 272) **associated with a source of audiovisual programming** (paragraph [0199]), **and a second window** (Figure 2, element 272 and/or 271) **associated with a connected recording device** (paragraph [0198]). Yap does not explicitly disclose **wherein a first identifier is displayed in association with said first window identifying said source of audiovisual programming associated with said first window from among a plurality of sources of audiovisual programming**. However, in analogous art, Alten

discloses displaying to users an indication of the source from which a program is being received (Fig. 37, column 27, lines 37-52), so that the user can know which programs are sourced from cable, satellite, broadcast, etc. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yap to include identifying the source of the programming. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, in that the user would have a way to know from which source the programming was coming.

Neither Yap nor Alten explicitly disclose **wherein a second identifier is displayed in association with said second window identifying said connected recording device associated with said second window**. However, in analogous art, Hirasawa discloses displaying to the user information indicative of recording source and recording destination (Figs. 70 A and 70B, column 40, lines 31-49). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yap and Alten to include identifying an associated recording device. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, in that the user would have a way to know where the material was being recorded.

Neither Yap, Alten nor Hirasawa explicitly disclose **wherein an electronic programming guide for said source of audiovisual programming associated with said first window is selectively displayed in said first window and a list of programs selected from said electronic programming guide to be recorded by said recording device associated with said second window is displayed in said second window when said electronic programming guide is displayed in said first window**. However, in analogous art, Baumgartner discloses that an EPG can show a list of scheduled recordings (Fig. 25, paragraph [0132]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include

displaying programs selected for future recording. This would have produced predictable and desirable results, in that the user would have a way to see if all of the programs he wanted to record were in fact scheduled to record.

Regarding claim 19, the combined teachings of the references cited above disclose **the video display device of claim 18**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said first window displays said audiovisual programming from said source of audiovisual programming** (paragraph [0199]).

Regarding claim 20, the combined teachings of the references cited above disclose **the video display device of claim 18**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said connected recording device is also a second source of audiovisual programming and said audiovisual programming from said recording device is displayed in said second window** (paragraph [0031]).

Regarding claim 21, the combined teachings of the references cited above disclose **the video display device of claim 18**, and Yap further discloses **further comprising a remote control unit, wherein said user interface further comprises on-screen controls for controlling said connected recording device, said on-screen controls being operated with said remote control unit** (paragraph [0041]).

Regarding claim 22, the combined teachings of the references cited above disclose **the video display device of claim 21**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said user interface further comprises a status identifier for identifying a current operation being performed by said connected recording device** (paragraphs [0196]-[0197], Table 1).

Regarding claim 23, the combined teachings of the references cited above disclose **the video display device of claim 21**, and Yap further discloses **wherein, when said on-screen controls are used to send a record command to said connected recording device (paragraph [0126]), said connected recording device automatically records said audiovisual programming being displayed in said first window** (paragraph [0199]).

Regarding claim 24, the combined teachings of the references cited above disclose **the video display device of claim 23**, and Yap further discloses **wherein, while said connected recording device is recording, said audiovisual programming is also displayed in said second window** (paragraph [0199]).

Regarding claim 25, the combined teachings of the references cited above disclose **the video display device of claim 21**, and Yap further discloses **wherein multiple recording devices are connected** (Figure 2, elements 205 and 255, paragraphs [0107] and [0152]-[0154], Figure 8, element 320), **said on-screen controls further comprising controls for selecting a recording device to be associated with said second window and controlled through said user interface** (paragraphs [0150]-[0151]).

Regarding claim 26, the combined teachings of the references cited above disclose **the video display device of claim 25**, and Hirasawa further discloses **wherein said user interface further comprises a device identifier for identifying which connected recording device is currently associated with said second window** (Figs. 70 A and 70B, column 40, lines 31-49).

This claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 18.

Regarding claim 27, the combined teachings of the references cited above disclose **the video display device of claim 18**, and Alten further discloses **wherein said user interface**

further comprises an identifier identifying said source of audiovisual programming, with multiple sources of audiovisual programming being available (Fig. 37, column 27, lines 37-52). This claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 18.

Regarding claim 28, the combined teachings of the references cited above disclose **the video display device of claim 27**, and Alten further discloses **wherein said user interface further comprises controls associated with said first window for selecting and controlling said source of audiovisual programming associated with said first window** (Fig. 37, column 27, lines 53-62). This claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 18.

Regarding claim 29, the combined teachings of the references cited above disclose **the video display device of claim 28**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said user interface further comprises a status identifier identifying a current operation being performed by said source of audiovisual programming** (paragraphs [0126] and [0149]-[0150]).

Regarding claim 30, the combined teachings of the references cited above disclose **the video display device of claim 18**, and Yap further discloses **wherein said connection to at least one recording device is an IEEE 1394 interface** (paragraph [0108]).

Regarding claim 31, the combined teachings of the references cited above disclose **the video display device of claim 18**, and Yap further discloses **further comprising a memory card in said video display device, wherein said memory card is said recording device associated with said second window** (paragraph [0158]).

Regarding claim 34, the combined teachings of the references cited above disclose **the video display device of claim 18**, and Yap further discloses **wherein multiple recording**

devices are connected and said user interface comprises controls for selecting which recording device is associated with said second window (paragraph [0127]).

Regarding claim 35, the combined teachings of the references cited above disclose **the video display device of claim 18**, and Alten further discloses **wherein multiple sources of audiovisual programming are connected and said user interface comprises controls for selecting which source of audiovisual programming is associated with said first window** (Fig. 37, column 27, lines 53-62). This claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 18.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOSHUA TAYLOR whose telephone number is (571)270-3755. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-5pm, M-F, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on (571) 272-7304. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Josh Taylor/
Examiner, Art Unit 2426

/VIVEK SRIVASTAVA/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2426